



UNITED STATES PATENT AND TRADEMARK OFFICE

Commissioner for Patents  
United States Patent and Trademark Office  
P.O. Box 1450  
Alexandria, VA 22313-1450  
[www.uspto.gov](http://www.uspto.gov)

**MORGAN & FINNEGAN**  
**3 WORLD FINANCIAL CENTER**  
**NEW YORK, NY 10281-2101**

**COPY MAILED**

**FEB 09 2006**

**OFFICE OF PETITIONS**

In re Application of :  
Kenneth L. Rinehart et al :  
Application No. 10/693,174 : DECISION ON PETITION  
Filed: October 23, 2003 : UNDER 37 CFR 1.78(a)(6)  
Attorney Docket No. 4126-4012 :  
:

This is a decision on the petition under 37 CFR 1.78(a)(6), filed November 18, 2005, to accept an unintentionally delayed claim under 35 U.S.C. § 119(e) for the benefit of the prior-filed provisional applications set forth in the concurrently filed amendment.

The petition is **DISMISSED**.

A petition under 37 CFR 1.78(a)(6) is only applicable to those applications filed on or after November 29, 2000. Further, the petition is appropriate only after expiration of the period specified in 37 CFR 1.78(a)(5)(ii) and must be filed during the pendency of the nonprovisional application. In addition, the petition must be accompanied by:

- (1) the reference required by 35 U.S.C. § 119(e) and 37 CFR 1.78(a)(5)(i) to the prior-filed application, unless previously submitted;
- (2) the surcharge set forth in § 1.17(t); and
- (3) a statement that the entire delay between the date the claim was due under 37 CFR 1.78(a)(5)(ii) and the date the claim was filed was unintentional. The Commissioner may require additional information where there is a question whether the delay was unintentional.

The petition fails to comply with item (1) above.

The concurrently filed amendment to add the prior-filed applications on page one following the first sentence of the specification is not acceptable as drafted since it improperly incorporates by reference the prior-filed applications. Petitioner's attention is directed to Dart Industries v. Banner, 636 F.2d 684, 207 USPQ 273 (C.A.D.C. 1980), where the court drew a distinction between a permissible 35 U.S.C. § 120 statement and the impermissible introduction of new matter by way of incorporation by reference in a 35 U.S.C. § 120 statement. The court specifically stated:

Section 120 merely provides a mechanism whereby an application becomes entitled to benefit of the filing date of an earlier application disclosing the same subject matter. Common subject matter must be disclosed, in both applications, either specifically or by an express incorporation-by-reference of prior disclosed subject matter. Nothing in section 120 itself operates to carry forward any disclosure from an earlier application. In re deSeversky *supra* at 674, 177 USPQ at 146-147. Section 120 contains no magical disclosure-augmenting powers able to pierce new matter barriers. It cannot, therefore, "limit" the absolute and express prohibition against new matter contained in section 251.

In order for the incorporation by reference statement to be effective as a proper safeguard against the omission of a portion of a prior application, the incorporation by reference statement must be included in the specification-as-filed, or in an amendment specifically referred to in an oath or declaration executing the application. *See In re deSeversky, supra. Note also MPEP 201.06(c).*

Accordingly, before the petition under 37 CFR 1.78(a)(6) can be granted, a substitute amendment<sup>1</sup> deleting the incorporation by reference statement and providing the filing date for provisional Application No. 60/043,599, along with a renewed petition under 37 CFR 1.78(a)(6), is required.

Further correspondence with respect to this matter should be addressed as follows:

By mail:                    Mail Stop PETITIONS  
                                  Commissioner for Patents  
                                  Post Office Box 1450  
                                  Alexandria, VA 22313-1450

By hand:                    Customer Service Window  
                                  Mail Stop Petitions  
                                  Randolph Building  
                                  401 Dulany Street  
                                  Alexandria, VA 22314

By fax:                     (571) 273-8300  
                                  ATTN: Office of Petitions

As authorized, the \$1,370 fee required by 37 CFR 1.78(a)(3)(ii) will be charged to petitioner's Deposit Account No. 13-4500.

---

<sup>1</sup> *Note 37 CFR 1.121*

Any questions concerning this matter may be directed to Wan Laymon at (571) 272-3220.

*Frances Hicks*

Frances Hicks

Lead Petitions Examiner

Office of Petitions